ACADEMIC HONESTY & INTEGRITY

WFPS ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The learners and staff at West Fargo Public Schools value academic honesty and integrity. A key part of an educator's job is to assess what a learner knows, understands and is able to do. Cheating produces results on assessments that do not allow an educator to accurately assess a learner's knowledge and skill, and thus makes it even harder for educators to help their learners succeed.

Academic Dishonesty includes, but is not limited to:

- Copying another learner's work.
- Submitting work that was completed by someone else as if it were your own.
- Plagiarism – Presenting another individual's ideas as your own, failing to cite others in writing.
- Unauthorized use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) – see AI practices for more information.
- Using unauthorized materials to complete any assessment.
- Completing work in a group when not authorized to do so by the educator.
- Looking at another learner's materials during any assessment when not authorized.
- Providing answers to another learner before or after a test and/or quiz.
- Taking educator materials (tests, keys, example questions, etc…) without receiving approval from the educator.
- Leaving classroom materials out and visible during an assessment.
- Using any form of technology (e.g. computers, calculators, cell phones) to provide or receive unauthorized content.
- Any other behavior in submitting work which is performed with the intent of misrepresenting one's performance.

CONSEQUENCES OF CHEATING:

 *Note – Refers to all classes (not per class) in one given school year

1st instance

- The educator will submit a referral form.
- The learner will receive a zero on the assignment or test.
- Consequences for academic dishonesty will be determined by the educator as indicated in the educator's syllabus.
- An entry will be made in the student information system – PowerSchool.
- The educator will notify parent/guardian via phone or email.

2nd instance

- A parent/guardian meeting with the educator, learner and administrator is scheduled.
- The educator will submit a referral form.
- The learner will receive a score of zero on the assessment with consequences for academic dishonesty determined by the educator as indicated in the educator's syllabus.
- An entry will be made in the student information system – PowerSchool.

3rd and subsequent instances

- The learner may be removed from the specific course receiving an F for a grade.
- The educator will submit a referral form.
- The learner will receive a score of zero on the assessment with consequences for academic dishonesty determined by the educator as indicated in the educator's syllabus.
- An entry will be made in the student information system – PowerSchool.
- The learner may be excluded from academic awards as determined by the building administration.
- The building administration will notify the learner's parent/guardian by phone or email.

The statements in this document are intended to provide guidance for daily procedures and practices in order to maintain order, efficiency, and continuity amongst our schools.

Definition: The use of AI is considered academic dishonesty when not authorized to do so by the educator. This means that only when the educator has given explicit permission to use AI for any portion of an assignment or assessment can it be used. If a learner is in doubt, they should ask their educator.

Educator Detection Protocol: An educator will have multiple data points to reference when suspecting academically dishonest use of AI. Approved options include:
- The **only** approved AI detection tool that educators can utilize is *TurnItIn*. This cannot be used exclusively to determine academic dishonesty. AI detection is not 100% reliable, free online tools are even less reliable.
- Comparing learner's work to previously submitted works, including previously submitted drafts.
- Classroom observation of learner behaviors and engagement.
- Inadequate amount of dedicated time to the task (time stamp, revision history, etc.)
- Comparison between AI generated responses and learner responses.
- Discrepancy in diction, word usage, and/or complexity.

This list is not exhaustive and may include other documentation from the educator.

Once an educator has reasonable suspicion that AI has been used based on the options above, they will attempt to have a conversation with the learner. This conversation will take place within a reasonable time frame. Prior to the conversation, an educator should not enter a comment related to AI detection in the gradebook, but will instead enter a zero with the missing indicator (orange square). The educator will enter a comment, requesting the learner have a conversation with their educator. If the learner refuses to have a conversation with the educator, parents will be notified and the policy for academic dishonesty will be followed.

Suggested guidance for conversation with learner:
- Educator will approach conversation in a non-accusatory manner to encourage productive discourse.
  - Starting a conversation by accusing a learner will be detrimental to the relationship between the educator and the learner. No AI detection tool is fool proof.
- Possible questions to ask: I'm not sure what you meant by this response, can you please rephrase it for me? I'm not sure what you meant by this word/phrase, what were you trying to say? What resources did you use to help with this response? Can you describe the process or show me any drafts that you used to create your response?

Based on the conversation with the learner, the educator will determine if the issue needs to progress to the Review Board. For instance, if a learner is insistent that it is not AI generated or plagiarism, the educator will prepare materials for the Review Board, which will objectively determine if it is academic dishonesty. Offer the learner a chance to provide evidence as well (version history, drafts, research, statements, etc).

Preparing Materials for the Review Board

The statements in this document are intended to provide guidance for daily procedures and practices in order to maintain order, efficiency, and continuity amongst our schools.

If the situation requires an objective review of the situation, it will go to the Review Board. The purpose of this panel is to review documentation from the educator and learner to make an objective determination as to whether it is considered academic dishonesty.

Based on the protocol above, here are some examples of materials that can be sent to this panel:

Educator Evidence
- *TurnItIn* AI Reports (Can be downloaded from *TurnItIn* submission).
- Previous work from the learner.
- Written Classroom Observations (Notes on how they used their time, deadlines, etc).
- An educator-created AI generated response (annotated for how it is similar to the learner's).
- Examples of word choice or writing that is beyond grade level or learner ability.

Learner Evidence
- A statement defending its authenticity. (A written explanation).
- Version history from Google or Word.
- Drafts and outlines.
- Research.

Reporting and Follow-Up: The panel will meet to consider provided evidence and determine if the work was AI generated or plagiarized. They will make a recommendation. Based on that recommendation, an educator may determine a consequence appropriate to their class or use the established district academic dishonesty policy. Consequences may be shared with learners in class in addition to this handbook information.

Educators will enter a log entry in PowerSchool to document the issue, regardless of progressing to the Review Board and regardless of the decision. These logs will provide documentation for repeat offenders.

The statements in this document are intended to provide guidance for daily procedures and practices in order to maintain order, efficiency, and continuity amongst our schools.